arXiv:0805.2309v2 [gr-qc] 21 May 2008

Comment to "On Anisotropic Dark Energy Stars"

Francisco S. N. Lobo‖

Institute of Cosmology & Gravitation, University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth PO1 2EG, UK

Centro de Astronomia e Astrofísica da Universidade de Lisboa, Campo Grande, Ed. C8 1749-016 Lisboa, Portugal

Abstract.

The authors of the paper "On Anisotropic Dark Energy Stars", arXiv:0803.2508 [gr-qc], consider the equations of state $p_r = \omega\rho$ and $p_t = \omega\rho$, ignoring the fact that this implies an isotropic pressure, which places strict restrictions on the values of ω. The authors then argue for an anisotropic pressure fluid throughout their work, and apply these equations of state to the energy conditions, consequently obtaining incorrect intervals for the parameter ω. This procedure invalidates their criticisms on the following paper: Class.Quant.Grav. **23**, 1525 (2006).

PACS numbers: 04.20.Jb, 04.40.Dg, 97.10.-q

‖ francisco.lobo@port.ac.uk

Although evidence for the existence of black holes is very convincing, a certain amount of scepticism regarding the physical reality of event horizons is still encountered, and it has been argued that despite the fact that observational data do indeed provide strong arguments in favor of event horizons, they cannot fundamentally prove their existence [1]. In part, due to this scepticism, a new picture for an alternative final state of gravitational collapse has emerged, where an interior compact object is matched to an exterior Schwarzschild vacuum spacetime, at or near where the event horizon is expected to form. Therefore, these alternative models do not possess a singularity at the origin and have no event horizon, as its rigid surface is located at a radius slightly greater than the Schwarzschild radius. In particular, the gravastar picture, proposed by Mazur and Mottola [2], has an effective phase transition at/near where the event horizon is expected to form, and the interior is replaced by a de Sitter condensate. The latter is then matched to a thick layer, with an equation of state given by $p = \rho$, which is in turn matched to an exterior Schwarzschild solution. It has also been argued that there is no way of distinguishing a Schwarzschild black hole from a gravastar from observational data [1].

In Ref. [3], a generalization of the gravastar picture was explored, by considering a matching of an interior solution governed by the dark energy equation of state, $\omega \equiv p/\rho < -1/3$, to an exterior Schwarzschild vacuum solution at a junction interface. The motivation for implementing this generalization arises from the fact that recent observations have confirmed an accelerated cosmic expansion, for which dark energy is a possible candidate. Several relativistic dark energy stellar configurations were analyzed by imposing specific choices for the mass function. The first case considered was that of a constant energy density, and the second choice, that of a monotonic decreasing energy density in the star's interior. The dynamical stability of the transition layer of these dark energy stars to linearized spherically symmetric radial perturbations about static equilibrium solutions was also explored. It was found that large stability regions exist that are sufficiently close to where the event horizon is expected to form, so that it was argued that it would be difficult to distinguish the exterior geometry of the dark energy stars, analyzed in this work, from an astrophysical black hole.

The authors of Ref. [4], criticize this work [3] (and other papers, namely, Refs. [5]) by stating that the procedure for determining the validity of the interval of the dark energy parameter ω is wrong. They then claim to propose a generalization of the limits of the parameter ω for the case of "anisotropic" fluids by considering the toy model of a constant energy density, $\rho = \rho_0 > 0$, analyzed in Ref. [3]. They argue that special attention must be paid to the limits for the parameter ω appearing in the equations of state $p_r = p_r(\rho)$ or $p_t = p_t(\rho)$, where ρ is the energy density, p_r the radial pressure and p_t is the tangential pressure. They further state that a revision is necessary of the interval of ω, in order to have a correct classification of dark, standard and phantom energy. Until this point, all is correct. However, the argument breaks down, when they consider the equations of state $p_r = \omega\rho$ and $p_t = \omega\rho$ at the outset, and apply these equations of state to the energy conditions of an anisotropic fluid. The authors ignore the fact that

taking into account $p_r = \omega\rho$ and $p_t = \omega\rho$ is simply equivalent to considering an isotropic pressure $p_r = p_t$. One should first and foremost determine the restrictions imposed on the parameter ω. Thus, due this flaw in their reasoning, their remaining analysis based on the bounds placed by the energy conditions is incorrect, as the authors are effectively considering an isotropic fluid throughout their work.

Specifically, we shall now go into the mathematical details. Using the simple toy model of a constant energy density of Ref. [3], the stress-energy tensor components are given by

$$\rho = \rho_0 \qquad p_r = \omega\rho_0 \,, \tag{1}$$

$$p_t = \omega\rho_0 \left[1 + \frac{m(r)}{2r}\frac{(1+\omega)(1+3\omega)}{\omega(1-2m(r)/r)}\right] \,, \tag{2}$$

with $m(r) = 4\pi\rho_0 r^3/3$.

Before going into the analysis of the energy conditions, note that considering $p_r = p_t$, imposes restrictions on the parameter ω, given by the following relationship:

$$(1+\omega)(1+3\omega) = 0 \,, \tag{3}$$

considering $m > 0$ and $(1 - 2m/r) > 0$. Thus, the parameter is restricted to the values $\omega = -1$ or $\omega = -1/3$.

Reviewing the energy conditions, the weak energy condition is given by $\rho \geq 0$, $\rho + p_r \geq 0$ and $\rho + p_t \geq 0$. The first condition is readily obeyed as we are considering a positive energy density, and the remaining two provide the following inequalities:

$$\omega \geq -1 \,, \tag{4}$$

$$3m(r)\omega^2 + 2r\omega + 2r - 3m(r) \geq 0 \,, \tag{5}$$

respectively.

The authors also consider the strong energy condition given by $\rho + p_r + 2p_t \geq 0$, which provides the following relationship

$$3m(r)\omega^2 + 4\omega[r - m(r)] + 2r - 3m(r) \geq 0 \,. \tag{6}$$

Note that the respective relationship in [4], namely, equation (12) is also incorrect.

Now, as the parameter values of ω are restricted at the outset by imposing $p_r = \omega\rho$ and $p_t = \omega\rho$ which implies $p_r = p_t$, the analysis considered by the authors of Ref. [4] on the intervals of ω is incorrect.

Imposing $\omega = -1$, the above energy conditions provide:

$$\rho + p_r = 0, \qquad \rho + p_t = 0, \qquad \rho + p_r + 2p_t = -2r(1 - 2m/r) < 0 \,. \tag{7}$$

Note the violation of the strong energy condition.

Imposing $\omega = -1/3$, from the energy conditions one finally arrives at

$$\rho + p_r = 2\rho_0/3 > 0, \qquad \rho + p_t = 4r(1 - 2m/r)/3 > 0, \tag{8}$$

$$\rho + p_r + 2p_t = 2r(1 - 2m/r)/3 > 0 \,. \tag{9}$$

The strong energy condition is not violated for this case, so that one does not have a repulsive interior solution, which is a necessary condition for gravastars or dark energy stars, so that one may rule out the case of $\omega = -1/3$.

In conclusion, the results of Ref. [4] are incorrect, based on a flaw in the reasoning of the authors from the outset. Specifically, by considering the equations of state $p_r = \omega\rho$ and $p_t = \omega\rho$, and ignoring the fact that this implies an isotropic pressure, the authors argue for an anisotropic pressure fluid throughout their work, and apply these equations of state to the energy conditions, obtaining incorrect intervals for the parameter ω.

References

[1] M. A. Abramowicz, W. Kluzniak and J. P. Lasota, "No observational proof of the black-hole event-horizon," Astron. Astrophys. 396 L31 (2002) [arXiv:astro-ph/0207270].

[2] P. O. Mazur and E. Mottola, "Gravitational Condensate Stars: An Alternative to Black Holes," [arXiv:gr-qc/0109035];
P. O. Mazur and E. Mottola, "Dark energy and condensate stars: Casimir energy in the large," [arXiv:gr-qc/0405111];
P. O. Mazur and E. Mottola, "Gravitational Vacuum Condensate Stars," Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. 111, 9545 (2004) [arXiv:gr-qc/0407075].

[3] F. S. N. Lobo, "Stable dark energy stars," Class. Quant. Grav. **23**, 1525 (2006) [arXiv:gr-qc/0508115].

[4] R. Chan, M. F. A. da Silva and J. F. Villas da Rocha, "On Anisotropic Dark Energy Stars," arXiv:0803.2508 [gr-qc].

[5] S. Sushkov, "Wormholes supported by a phantom energy," Phys. Rev. D **71**, 043520 (2005) [arXiv:gr-qc/0502084];
F. S. N. Lobo, "Phantom energy traversable wormholes," Phys. Rev. D **71**, 084011 (2005) [arXiv:gr-qc/0502099];
F. S. N. Lobo, "Stability of phantom wormholes," Phys. Rev. **D71**, 124022 (2005) [arXiv:gr-qc/0506001].